UNITY

FREEDOM, FELLOWSHIP AND CHARACTER IN RELIGION

George Washington's Foreign Policy - - - - - - - - *Flora White*

Should the Entire German Nation Be Indicted? - - *Kenneth G. Darling*

Children of Working Mothers - *Ethel S. Beer*

Shakespeare and the Clergy - - - - - - - - - *John Haynes Holmes*

Western Unitarian Conference News

VOLUME CXXX NUMBER 12

Chicago, February, 1945

PRICE FIFTEEN CENTS

UNITY

Established 1878
(Jenkin Lloyd Jones, Editor, 1880-1918)

Published Monthly *Subscription $1.50*
Until Further Notice *Single Copies 15 cents*

Published by The Abraham Lincoln Centre, 700 Oakwood Blvd., Chicago 15, Ill.
"Entered as Second-Class Matter, April 11, 1941, at the Post Office at Chicago, Illinois, under Act of March 3, 1879."

JOHN HAYNES HOLMES, *Editor* CURTIS W. REESE, *Managing Editor*

Contributors

Ethel S. Beer: Author of *Day Nursery.*

Kenneth G. Darling: Engaged in editorial work with Ginn & Company; author of *A Tour of Bavaria and the Tyrol.*

Jack Mendelsohn, Jr.: Minister of the Beverly Unitarian Fellowship of Chicago, Illinois.

C. A. Hawley: Minister of First Presbyterian Church, Atchison, Kansas.

Flora White: New England author and old friend of UNITY.

Contents

EDITORIAL—

Editorial Comments—JOHN HAYNES HOLMES 179

Jottings—JOHN HAYNES HOLMES 182

ARTICLES—

George Washington's Foreign Policy—FLORA WHITE 182

Should the Entire German Nation Be Indicted?—KENNETH G. DARLING 183

Children of Working Mothers—ETHEL S. BEER 184

Shakespeare and the Clergy—JOHN HAYNES HOLMES 188

POETRY—

Peace Loan—DONALD WING HATHAWAY 181

THE STUDY TABLE—

Religious Pioneering—JACK MENDELSOHN, JR. 190

Russia, Past and Present—C. A. HAWLEY 191

WESTERN UNITARIAN CONFERENCE NEWS 192

THE FIELD—

British Conscientious Objectors—*The Inquirer,* London 178

The Field

"The world is my country, to do good is my Religion."

British Conscientious Objectors
(By a "C.O.")

Although it is often claimed that in defeating Nazism, the British Government has adopted the machinery and methods of a Fascist dictatorship, this conclusion is really proved wrong by the continued recognition of the conscientious objector to military service.

The issue is of tremendous importance by implication, for the provision for this type of exemption under the National Service Acts is not merely a humanitarian attempt to save a small minority from being forced to do something it feels to be wrong. It is a recognition by the Government that the individual citizen may feel a higher loyalty to God or to his own private philosophy than to the State as such. In that there is much significance, as in Fascist states the state has always claimed to be supreme in an absolute sense above the individual. The propaganda value alone of this to the Allied cause in Europe cannot therefore be estimated.

What is more, in this war there has been a serious attempt to satisfy the demands of bodies like the Society of Friends whose hostility to individual participation in warfare has a history of nearly three hundred years, and the requirements of public opinion which demands some form of sacrifice on the part of each citizen in wartime. This forms a striking contrast to the situation in the last war, when hundreds of conscientious objectors were imprisoned.

Under the National Service Acts men and women conscientious objectors can be unconditionally or conditionally registered in the Register of Conscientious Objectors or be made liable for non-combatant service in the Armed Forces.

Up till June 30, 1944, of over 8,000,000 men registered under these Acts, 66,346 or .82 per cent applied for registration as C.O.'s. The percentage of C.O.'s has steadily declined at successive registrations.

Actually, however, the Tribunals have only heard 58,216 of these cases, since some applicants were in reserved occupations and others were withdrawn. Of those applying, 3,350 men were registered unconditionally, about 5.8 per cent; 25 per cent of the applicants to the Tribunals were registered for non-combatant work in the Forces.

Some of these men, for example, on D-Day travelled with the airborne troops and undertook medical work.

Of the provisionally registered C.O.'s 20.6 per cent failed to prove their cases before the Tribunals and were duly called up to the Forces.

The Ministry of Labour appears to have genuinely tried to select men capable of understanding the objector's point of view for the Tribunals. There are seventeen local Tribunals of six members, presided over in England by a County Court judge and in Scotland by a sheriff or

(*Continued on page* 191)

UNITY

"He Hath Made of One All Nations of Men"

Volume CXXX FEBRUARY, 1945 No. 12

Editorial Comments

JOHN HAYNES HOLMES

I

The tragedy of all this [the German counterattack] is that while such a prolongation of the war cannot prevent an Allied victory, it can cost precious lives and endanger the peace. For the longer the war continues, the greater becomes Europe's physical and moral exhaustion, and the harder it will be to restore even a semblance of law and order to avert anarchy and chaos.—*New York Times,* January 8, 1945.

Here is the frankest statement that I have seen of the evil of prolonging this war, and the strongest argument therefore for bringing it speedily to a close. The longer the war continues, the greater the exhaustion on both sides; the greater the exhaustion, the more complete the mental and spiritual demoralization *on both sides;* and the greater this demoralization, the more difficult, if not impossible, the making of a peace that will endure. The war has only to last long enough to cast the world into utter "anarchy and chaos." Then why should not every effort be made to stop it? Instead of standing on the bedrock of "unconditional surrender," why should we not state the terms under which we will accept surrender and grant an armistice? This "unconditional surrender" business can do nothing but drive the Germans to the last stages of desperation, and keep them fighting to the last man on the last square yard of territory. Terms, however, even stiff terms, will tempt the people in the Reich to turn against their fanatical and fear-crazed government, and get rid of Hitler, just as in the last war they got rid of the Kaiser. The prolongation of the war, in other words, is our responsibility—and ours also the responsibility for all the horror that may follow upon a struggle continued to the bitter end. In the face of such a responsibility, how dare we continue our present intransigent policy? If we have no concern for the German people, should we not at least consider ourselves and the multitudes of stricken and helpless civilians in continental Europe? Slowly but surely our whole world is perishing in this war. Our vitality, our wealth, our sanity of mind, our integrity of spirit, our high purposes and unselfish motives—all are seeping away. A few more years of conflict, and this world will be a madhouse, with hordes of people seeking desperately just to survive another day. Then it will be too late for terms, or peace, or anything else to save mankind. We have been "too late" many times in the war. Are we going to be too late now in the peace?

II

I do not pretend to know much about China, but I know enough to know that the war is being lost in that part of the world far faster than it is being won in Europe. The recent military gains of the Japanese in Southeastern China are of enormous significance (the lost airfield at Kweilin cost us no less than $70,000,000, and its importance was in proportion to its cost). The Kuomintang government, a dictatorship maintained by force, chicanery, and Allied money, has control of only a small portion of Chinese territory. Famine has clutched great masses of the people, and reduced myriads of wretched folk to open cannibalism. Says Mr. Harry Paxton Howard, in a recent issue of the *Progressive,* the Kuomintang "appears to the common people of China to be tied to the losing side in a war between the Powers over the living body of China." How long the regime can hold out is anybody's guess, but it is easy to forecast the future. The present fighting will go on, with as much progress by the Japanese as they feel it worth-while to accomplish. Then, at the appropriate moment, will appear Russia, to take over the China of Chiang Kai-shek very much as she took over in Europe the Jugoslavia of General Mikhailovitch. Already there is the Chinese Tito in the field, to gobble up the country as soon as the tip comes from Moscow. This will come whenever Russia is reasonably disentangled from her war against Germany, and the Japanese are sufficiently hard pressed in the Philippines and on the sea, and perhaps also in Burma. What this all means, of course, is the same Russian ascendancy in Asia that is now so definitely forecast in Europe. It is Stalin who is winning this war both east and west, and it is Stalin, therefore, with whom we shall have to deal, both east and west, when this war is done. The net result of all our sacrifices, in other words, will be a world tyranny as much more powerful than Hitler as Hitler in turn was more powerful than Kaiser Wilhelm II. Just where a free world comes into this picture may be hard to see. But some day, perhaps, we are going to learn that war is an uncertain quantity. It never was more uncertain than in China. Take

Chiang Kai-shek and the Chinese Communists backed by Moscow, then add to these the British Empire resolved to get back its pre-war holdings, and you get a mess which offers little promise of peace and much of war. Thus does the present conflict sweep on to its appointed end of tragedy in victory.

III

What the Negro Wants is the title of a recent book of great importance. It consists of a symposium of fourteen opinions offered by as many distinguished American Negroes. The Editor of the volume declares that five of the contributors are radicals, five are liberals, and the remaining four are conservatives. But I would defy any one not familiar with the Negro leaders of this country to recognize one group as set apart from the other two. The significant thing about this book is that all the writers are agreed—they give the same answer to the same question. What does the Negro want? He wants not liberty—he has his liberty, and a lot of good it does him! What he wants now is *equality*—"an equal share with others in the performance of responsibilities and obligations, of course, but also in the enjoyment of rights and opportunities." This equality means substantially three things. First, political equality, of which the right to vote is supreme and perfect. The Negro must be given free access to the ballot box and here, if nowhere else, confront the principle that "a man's a man for a' that." Secondly, it means economic equality—the right, on free terms of competition or cooperation with the white man, to a job, which in essence is the right to life itself. At present the Negro in this country is economically free and equal only in the field of menial occupation. He is allowed without interference to do anything that nobody else wants to do. It is when he crosses the line into the trades and the professions that trouble begins. It is here that organized labor has a great responsibility. And so have we all—to see that employment is open to any Negro on the basis of ability, training, and character. Lastly, equality means social equality. Yes, *social* equality! by which I mean that the Negro shall move as freely and easily in the currents of our social life as a drop of water in the flowing of a stream. That a Negro, like a white man, shall be able to come and go, walk and ride, eat and sleep, buy a house and enter a church, all untroubled by consciousness of differences and disabilities, of closed doors and barred roads, of affronts, indignities, and insults! That a Negro shall be able to live from day to day without a thought at any moment of his color! Social equality means a normal and natural place in the human family. Why not? At present we have a caste society in this country. This is as bad today as slavery was yesterday. The Negro demands an end of it—and it is the problem of the white American to see that this demand is granted. The Negro wants his rights, and, if there is a God in heaven, will get them.

IV

Lloyd George, who retired from Parliament last month, after fifty-four years of uninterrupted service in the House of Commons, yields his record to only one longer period. This is the sixty-two years of Mr. Gladstone, who retired in 1894 in his eighty-fifth year, after having been four times Prime Minister. There is no such glory in Lloyd George's career as in that of his immortal predecessor, though the Welshman may be said to have had his hour of supreme glory in the dark days of the first World War which he carried through to victory. But Mr. George's greatest period, I have always thought, was in the early days when, as Chancellor of the Exchequer in the great Asquith ministry, he carried through his "People's Budget" and initiated, in the face of terrific opposition, his far-flung program of social legislation. Winston Churchill was with him in those days, and it was tremendous drama as well as momentous history. Then came unhappy episodes—particularly the overthrow of the Asquith cabinet which was rank betrayal from within, with Lloyd George the chief conspirator. At the close of the war came the so-called "khaki" election, with its disgraceful slogan of "hang the Kaiser." But the supreme tragedy was Versailles, which was mainly the handiwork of Lloyd George and Clemenceau as over against Woodrow Wilson. It is said that when the British Prime Minister saw what he had done, he started back in affright, and tried too late to undo or modify his work. But the treaty stood—and more than any other one thing must be held responsible for the second World War. I have often wondered what Lloyd George has been thinking these last years, as he has beheld the horror which he so effectually helped to bring upon the world. But I suppose that, like any other man, he has rationalized his role into one of innocence. There remains, however, the inexorable judgment of history. The weakness of Lloyd George was not in intellect or courage, but in character. He lacked what William Ewart Gladstone possessed so supremely —namely, conscience. Mr. George was at the best brilliantly clever, and at the worst morally unscrupulous. He was moved by sincere passion in his early years, when he was a true and valiant tribune of the people. Then, with success, came ambition, and a willingness to do anything to serve his personal interests. He became in the end not the great statesman, like Gladstone, but the consummate politician. After 1919, nobody trusted him. He had no party, hardly any friends, and the people had turned away. There is tragedy in all this, especially in these closing days of obscurity. There is nothing, after all, to take the place of honor. Wolsey found this out in his time, and Lloyd George has found it out in ours. For certain

great public services, he will be remembered—but as a man, he will be forgotten.

V

The appointment of Geoffrey Francis Fisher, Bishop of London, to the arch-episcopate of Canterbury and thus to the headship of the English Church, was a surprise. I had assumed, with many others, that the great Archbishop of York would become successor to the late William Temple. I wonder what it was that stood in the way—his extremely favorable views toward Soviet Russia, for example? Is the Prime Minister already building up his defenses against what General Smuts has described as the "colossus" of Europe? We shall never know! But meanwhile, at the suggestion of the Prime Minister, His Majesty has named this undistinguished man whose personal reputation is excellent but whose public influence is unimportant. A leadership, in other words, second only to that of the Prime Minister himself, in an age critical to England and to the world, is placed in hands untested and untried. It is true that, as Bishop of London during the five years of the present war, Dr. Fisher served faithfully and well in one of the most tragic situations of modern times. He showed courage and patience, which are great qualities. But at no time did he loom, in intellect and personality, among the great figures of the British realm. I do not recall a single forecast of Dr. Temple's successor which contained Dr. Fisher's name. It is now rather pathetic to read the comments upon his appointment, and note with what difficulty anyone finds anything particular to say. Which raises the whole question as to the wisdom of making the greatest religious office in England a political prerogative of the Prime Minister! Contrast this system with that of the Roman Church, where the Pope is chosen by the cardinals from their own number. Would it not be well to have the English bishops the real electors of their own Primate? Of course, when the Roman system of election produces a Pius X and the English system of appointment a William Temple, it is a temptation to leave well enough alone. But what about it when a Pius XII gains the throne of Peter, and a Francis Fisher enters the sacred precincts of Canterbury? Well, it all depends—like the presidency of the United States which in four years produced a Lincoln to follow a Buchanan. In the present instance, it is to be hoped that the new Archbishop will rise to the challenge of his office and of the times. Few men in history have been given such an opportunity to lead the conscience of mankind, and to "make smooth in the desert a highway for our God."

VI

Romain Rolland was several times in this war reported dead or in a German concentration camp. These stories showed the continuing interest of the world in this great contemporary figure. At last came the authentic word that Rolland had died in his home in Vesalay, France, in the seventy-eighth year of his age. Few men have so stirred the admiration of mankind, or won such contempt and hatred from their own country. "A prophet not without honor."! To appreciate the drama of Rolland's career, one must remember that when the last war broke out in 1914, he was the outstanding author of France, and indeed of the European continent. For years he had been writing, and publishing in successive volumes, his immortal masterpiece, *Jean Christophe*. This is now seen to be not only a great literary achievement, but a forecast, of amazing accuracy and poignancy, of the impending collapse of our civilization. It won for him in 1916 the supreme distinction of the Nobel Prize for literature. It was while Rolland was thus in the flood tide of his fame and influence, that the first World War engulfed his country. With heroic courage and prophetic vision, he took the extreme pacifist position in relation to this struggle. He described it as a civil war, destined to wreck our world; and he called upon idealists and leaders of culture in all countries to disattach themselves from the work of force and violence, and unite to save the threatened values of the race. This appeal to the higher conscience of mankind was given unforgettable expression in that great work, *Above the Battle*. In a night, Rolland's reputation was gone. Passing into voluntary exile in Switzerland, he remained in that country for twenty-five years, despised and rejected of his own countrymen, but loved and adored by young idealists the world around. Swiftly Rolland became the great international figure of his time. In a succession of brilliant writings—*Clerambault*, among others—and in thousands of letters that poured annually from his pen, he kept contact with men in every land, and amid the havoc and hate of arms, bound fast the ties of brotherhood. The Rolland fraternity was like a dream of peace come true, with the little home on Lake Geneva at Villeneuve the central shrine. It was natural that Gandhi should become a member of that company, and Rolland write a biography of the great Indian. Then came the second World War, after Romain Rolland had taken heart again and returned to France. He seemed for a moment to lose his pacifism in the horror of 1939, but it was only for a moment. The great soul remained true—and now, in his death, lives immortally.

Peace Loan

If half the cost of war,
A fraction of all its zeal,
Were ever lavished for
The good of all: to heal,
To comfort, clothe, and feed
The very last and least,
We would have peace indeed,
The guns forever ceased.

DONALD WING HATHAWAY.

Jottings

When Harold Laski, as Chairman of the British Labor Party, described Prime Minister Churchill, at the recent Party Conference, as a "gallant and romantic relic of eighteenth century imperialism," some of the rest of us may be pardoned for having an opinion, too!

It was a dispute over Poland which started this second World War. Now, in the midst of this war, we have another dispute over Poland. Will this second dispute wreck this war—or lead to a third World War? Quite a commentary on the question as to what is ever settled by a war!

King George VI, of England, declares that this war is being fought and won "to create a world of free men untouched by tyranny." Congratulations to India! Or is India not included in this declaration, as she was not included in the Atlantic Charter?

This war will be over when it is over. It has a long time still to run. The churches need not hurry in their plans and preparations for V-Day. There are plenty of days left in which to get ready—*alas!*

A grand hullabaloo over the lack of nurses in the armed service is now upon us. Conscript nurses, says the President! Yet there are 9,000 Negro nurses at this moment eager and ready to go, and the government pays no attention. Our boys must bleed and die untended, just to preserve the sanctity of Jim Crow!

There is a newspaper called *"P. M."* and a whiskey bearing the same name. And you would be surprised —or *would* you be surprised?—how little difference there is between them.

JOHN HAYNES HOLMES.

George Washington's Foreign Policy

FLORA WHITE

At this moment we are somewhat in doubt as to the exact nature of the foreign policy of our country—the United States of America. We are also somewhat in doubt as to the exact nature of the foreign policy of our ally, Great Britain.

Fortunately for us George Washington in his Farewell Address leaves not the shadow of a doubt as to the exact nature of the foreign policy he proposes that these United States should follow. Our first President is possibly a bit too discursive and self-consciously modest in the first half of his Farewell Address, but in the concluding half he lays down with superb clarity the exact course that the United States of America is to pursue in its relations with other nations. First, foremost, and forever, the principle of unity is to be made not only our guiding star but the very basis of our strength.

Now if we ask: What power, what force is to create this unity?—a unity in regard to which George Washington says, "It is of infinite importance that we should properly estimate its immense value,"—his answer is immediately forthcoming: "Our unity must and will be based upon our love of liberty." Not a love of liberty, he explains, for the individual self merely, but a love of liberty for every citizen of this free country—the United States of America. And should one chance to ask: What has this to do with the foreign policy of our country?—George Washington's answer is again forthcoming: This unity based upon a love of liberty for all is the necessary and essential foundation on which to build a foreign policy.

George Washington lays particular stress upon harmony among nations and also upon harmony among different sections of our own free country having different and more or less purely sectional interests. He sharply warns us against becoming excessively absorbed in a given locality and that particular locality's interests. By means of this warning he incites us to a higher, more all-embracing emotion, tending to create an undefeatable strength of purpose. His admonition in regard to over-absorption in any localized community interests, as opposed to national interests, is greatly enhanced by his showing that the final outcome is the creation of factions that weaken the solidarity which is fundamental to an effective foreign policy.

In this connection he points out that while the party spirit may perhaps be safely indulged by a monarchial government, in a free government, created by the people for the people, such indulgence opens the door to foreign influence and corruption. He describes this party spirit as "a fire not to be quenched" but guarded, lest instead of warming it consumes.

While by both argument and reiteration, George Washington proves as well as asserts that "unity is the prop of liberty" he foresees, even within that basic principle, possibilities that may lead to disaster. And again he gives us pertinent warnings—warnings against huge armaments that always arouse suspicion and resentment, warnings that a good will policy toward all nations is a safer precaution in preventing disastrous involvements than an excess of armaments.

He states clearly and emphatically that there should be no commercially favored nation. Also that our absolute neutrality concerning the disputes of other nations is demanded by both justice and intelligence. He shows that a wise foreign policy would be greatly menaced by permitting political considerations to determine, or even to modify, our commercial relations with other nations.

He predicts for the future of America an ideal very close to his heart—namely, a nation governed in its foreign policy wholly by justice and benevolence and the

will to peace. But again he warns that threatening the fulfillment of this ideal would be an indulgence in antipathies, resentments, animosities,— and not only these but unreasoning, passionate attachments which might readily lead to attitudes disloyal to one's own country. While opposing all such extravagant indulgence in emotions, which are more than likely to detract from a firm foreign policy, George Washington goes on to warn us of an even greater danger—the danger of indulging in *hatreds* which make men slaves to their emotions, creating a mental and spiritual blindness to those higher values, a perception of which must be a supreme factor in determining the relations of one's own country with other nations. He then declares that as a matter of fact both antipathies and favoritisms are breeders of wars.

He says: "Against the insidious wiles of foreign influence (I conjure you to believe me fellow citizens) the jealousy of a free people ought to be constantly awake, since history and experience prove that foreign influence is one of the most baneful foes of free government." Because of this undeniable fact, which he states thus clearly and unequivocally, he adds the further warning—avoid European alliances: "Why, by interweaving our destiny with that of any part of Europe, entangle our peace and prosperity?" And then he predicts that the future will show that these United States of America will have the power to choose peace or war.

This prediction he follows with the significant question: "Why toss aside any opportunity to promote peace? Why quit our own soil to stand on foreign ground?" At this point George Washington shows himself to be a true philosopher for all time.

He has conscientiously and consciously set forth the main features of a firm and wise foreign policy—a policy founded on a unity created by a love of liberty, a policy of good will toward all nations, embodying the principles of justice and benevolence; eliminating antipathies, resentments, animosities, as well as favoritisms; condemning all hatreds as war-breeding; and guarding against sectionalism within the country, and political obligations through commercial relations He is conscious, as I have said, that he has made the main principles of his foreign policy quite clear. Yet he is not satisfied.

With a philosophy of thought as keen as that of Plato, he seems to ask himself: But on what forces within mankind can we rely to secure the fulfillment of this ideal of a foreign policy? And again the answer comes swiftly, clearly, definitely. The force on which we may rely for the fulfillment of our ideal of a foreign policy is the force of a morality based upon religion. George Washington states explicitly in his Farewell Address, that the strength and integrity of the nation are absolutely essential to a firm foreign policy; and that this strength and this integrity are wholly dependent, as are unity and sound government, on morality and religion.

Before closing his Farewell Address, setting forth his ideal of a foreign policy, he again takes up and reemphasizes the vital need of the Neutrality Act which he sponsored and pleads to have maintained. He says that the duty of holding a neutral position may be inferred from the obligations that justice and humanity impose on every nation. And in alluding to his own Neutrality Act he states: "After deliberate examination . . . I was well satisfied that our country . . . had a right to take, and was bound in duty to take a neutral position." He also asks that the word *"American"* be exalted far above and beyond any local attachments, by every individual in this nation. He exhorts us to guard the word with jealous anxiety; and in almost the same breath he bids us remember that the right to establish a free government implies the duty to obey as well as to maintain its laws.

No intelligent person can read the Farewell Address of George Washington and reflect upon the implications of the foreign policy there set forth, without being profoundly impressed not only with the far-reaching philosophy embodied in his ideal but with the certainty that our first President foresaw the dire need of its application today.

Should the Entire German Nation Be Indicted?

KENNETH G. DARLING

The invasion of the Rhineland by the Allied forces and the imminent doom of Nazism have naturally elicited a flood of suggestions respecting the proper policy to adopt in dealing with the Germans after their final subjugation. It seems to me that the assessment of responsibility for the aggression and atrocities of the Nazi government exhibits, on the whole, a lamentable oversimplification of the problem! It is contended that—apart from the émigrés, the liquidated elements, and the inmates of the concentration camps—the entire German nation is guilty, either actively or passively, of participation in the Nazi conspiracy, having supported or at least acquiesced in Hitler's plot of world conquest so long as it appeared to prosper.

It is obvious that in framing a program of administering the country the Allies must be on their guard against specious disavowals of responsibility based on the plea that the rank and file of the population were *compelled* to carry out the behests of the Nazi gang since it constituted the only lawful regime—that is, that they were acting merely under duress. For it is quite evident that the most hardened member of the S.S. or Gestapo, when brought to bay, might seek refuge beneath just such a mask.

But whereas no reasonable person can doubt the acute difficulty of separating the sheep from the goats, it is wholly unwarranted, I submit, to draw up an indictment of the entire nation! Let us recall the circumstances under which the present government came to power. The harsh terms of the Treaty of Versailles, with its repudiation of many of the cardinal doctrines of Wilson's "Fourteen Points" and even of some of the armistice conditions, the postwar starvation blockade of Germany, and the disastrous effects of the inflation of 1923 and the subsequent depression evoked a sense of bitterness, frustration, and despair which predisposed the masses to lend a willing ear to any demagogue who could offer a prospect of relief from the twofold onus of national humiliation and economic hardship. Taking advantage of this widespread disaffection, the Hitlerites, with the aid of a diabolically ingenious and cunning system of propaganda, rode into

power, throwing off the mask only when they were so firmly entrenched that all opposition could be promptly crushed by the Gestapo. Dissent, to be effective, would of course require counter-organization; and the nucleus of such an organization could be all too easily dealt with through judicial murder or the concentration camp!

Not content with these tactics, the Nazis proceeded to indoctrinate the youth with their bestial "philosophy," to ensure that the rising generation should be untainted by the ethical and cultural standards painfully built up through long centuries of evolution from the mores of the jungle. Here, it seems to me, is the crux of the whole question of properly assessing Germany's guilt. Witnessing the extermination of Lidice, the mass slaughter of the Jews, the horrors of the "murder factory" at Lublin, the indiscriminate killing of hostages, and the like, one not unnaturally jumps to the conclusion that only an inherent strain of brutality peculiar to the German stock can account for such wholesale barbarities. But this deduction—however plausible on the surface—betrays a deplorable ignorance of human psychology. The ethical and cultural traits of a given people are determined essentially not by congenital endowments but rather by training and experience, which are largely a matter of historical accident. The plastic material of the adolescent mind and temperament may be molded into virtually any shape desired. Granted a favorable social environment, it may produce the fine type of youth—scrupulous, altruistic, idealistic, and mentally alert—which I encountered in pre-Nazi Germany. On the other hand, systematically imbued with contempt for such values as honesty, sympathy, tolerance, and open-mindedness, it will inevitably yield a throwback to the caveman type; and this applies not only to the Germans but to every nation or race under the sun!

Perhaps more concrete evidence is needed to refute the charges that the Germans are temperamentally depraved or perverse and that in this war they have made common cause with their Nazi overlords. In the first place, prior to World War I it was universally conceded that the German immigrants were *among the very finest stock that had come to our shores.* In addition to their industry and thrift, their law-abiding tendencies, and their superior intelligence, they were praised for their sterling character and their strongly developed social and humanitarian consciousness, as attested, for instance, by their support, during the Civil War, of the Union and the emancipation of the slaves. In the second place, it is estimated that the Gestapo comprises approximately three quarters of a million men, most of whom are on duty *in the Reich itself,* and that no fewer than two million Germans have been confined, at one time or another, in the concentration camps. These figures eloquently proclaim—as was pointed out by Dr. John Haynes Holmes in a recent sermon at the Community Church of New York City—that the populace as a whole has to be forcibly held in subjection lest it break loose in revolt against the tyranny of the Fuehrer and his henchmen!

The obvious lesson to be drawn from the foregoing facts and conclusions is that the only possible cure for the present malady of the Reich is the reconditioning of the rising generation—a task involving, to be sure, well-nigh insuperable difficulties, but one which must somehow be achieved if the tremendous sacrifices of the democratic peoples during the past five years shall not have been in vain. As Otto D. Tolischus observed in *The New York Times Magazine* last February, "this ideological extermination is more important than any physical extermination of the guilty. It is the most important problem confronting the Allies after the war."

Children of Working Mothers

ETHEL S. BEER

With so many mothers going to work today the question arises as to what happens to their children. How are they cared for during the day when their mother is out of the home? In the majority of these cases there is no money to pay a servant or to send the child to an all-day private school. The mothers work because of economic pressure. Therefore they must rely on a social agency for the placement of their children. Day Nurseries exist for this purpose.

To such poor families the Day Nursery is a veritable boon. The mother does not need to be separated from her children. Thus they are not deprived of natural affection. Also, since they are at home at night and during the weekend, the parents do not lose their influence over them. The Day Nursery makes an important contribution by keeping families together. No wonder they are grateful for its services!

The Day Nursery also helps to prevent the neglect of children. Because of it, fewer children are left at home without supervision. Undoubtedly many accidents are averted by the fact that working mothers can leave their children in a Day Nursery. The vitality of children cannot be quenched. It is sure to lead children into mischief if they are left to their own devices for long periods. How can anything else be expected, particularly when they are shut up in the cramped quarters of a tenement? The Day Nursery, then, saves many children from harm. Is this not a worthwhile contribution?

The germ of the Day Nursery movement goes back to Switzerland in the eighteenth century. A pretty story is told about Pastor Jean Freidrich Oberlin. One day while passing through a small village in the Vosges he heard childish voices. Upon investigation he found a young girl, Louise Scheppler, in charge of a group of children whose mothers were at work in the fields. This prompted him to start a *garderie* in his own presbytery during the agricultural season, which was really a primitive Day Nursery.

But it was industrial conditions that caused the growth of the Day Nursery. In France, Firmin Marbeau founded the first *creche*—conceded to be the forerunner of our Day Nursery—at Chaillot, a suburb of Paris, in 1844. Today the majority of European and some Asiatic countries have Day Nurseries. In fact, it is probable that since the war there are even more than formerly.

In the United States the Nursery and Child's Hos-

pital in New York opened a Day Nursery in 1854. This was limited to the children of women who had been patients in the hospital. In 1858 a Day Nursery was established at Troy, New York, which is still in operation today. It is the oldest Day Nursery in the United States. At the Chicago World's Fair in the 1890's, there was a model Day Nursery which stimulated the movement tremendously.

On the whole, the supervision of Day Nurseries in the United States is left to private agencies, supported by voluntary contributions and membership dues. But in certain places Day Nurseries are licensed by the Board of Health. And some are incorporated by the State Department of Welfare. The private agencies are local associations for standard raising and coordination which vary greatly in efficiency. Until recently there was also a national body for the whole country with headquarters in New York. Founded in 1898 as the National Federation of Day Nurseries, it later merged with the New York Association and was known as the National Association of Day Nurseries. Now it is dissolved and the Child Welfare League of America is taking over its function. Although not all Day Nurseries belong to any of these organizations, they do affect the whole movement. This was particularly true of the national body, although it was never sufficiently developed.

In the United States the number of Day Nurseries has fluctuated. In 1931 there were 800. This dropped in 1934 to about 659, only to rise again to 684 in 1936. In 1938 the National Association of Day Nurseries claimed that there were only approximately 590. Probably since the war the figure has increased somewhat, as new Day Nurseries have been founded. On the other hand old ones have closed for lack of funds.

The majority of Day Nurseries are supported by private enterprise. They either receive donations directly or from a larger collecting agency, such as a community chest or a religious organization. For the most part they are dependent upon the public for their maintenance. If they receive government aid, it generally is only for a portion of the program. A teacher may be supplied by the Board of Education. Or there may be a Nursery School under government auspices in the Day Nursery.

Originally the Day Nursery was merely a shelter for the children of working mothers. Gradually the emphasis shifted to the welfare of the child. Lastly the family entered the picture because the background of the child cannot be ignored. This means that the Day Nursery has developed from a custodial institution to a real center for the care and study of children. It should include health, education, and, above all, social service. Always the Day Nursery is a social agency because it deals with an abnormal condition—a mother out of the home all day. Also, the group it serves usually is underprivileged. Mothers whose earnings are considerable ordinarily make other arrangements for their children. There is, however, a certain range in the incomes of Day Nursery families, particularly since the war.

For this reason there is a sliding scale of fees, ranging from 5 cents, or even nothing, to 50 cents or occasionally more. Undoubtedly the average has gone up recently with the increased earnings of so many parents. Nevertheless, a Day Nursery cannot be run on the money thus collected. In 1940 at the National Conference of Social Work, $1.00 a day was calculated as the average amount spent for each child in Day Nurseries throughout the country. Probably it would be higher today. The exact cost depends on the attendance, the program, and so forth. Other things being equal, a large Day Nursery is cheaper to run per child than a small one. But a Day Nursery can expand indefinitely. Budgets run as high as twenty to thirty thousand dollars a year or even more. Does this seem like a great deal? Not in view of the valuable contribution that a Day Nursery can make.

Obviously the mother who can depend on a Day Nursery for the care of her child feels relieved. She can go to work with confidence. She knows that at least the Day Nursery will keep her child safe. Often, too, it will receive certain advantages. In any case, the Day Nursery is preferable to the usual playground in slum districts—the dangerous streets.

It is evident that the Day Nursery has a double purpose. It is intended to help both mother and child. Thus the emphasis is divided. The problem is a complicated one because the endeavor to assist as many mothers as possible may mean sacrificing the welfare of the individual child. If children are huddled together they do not thrive. A Day Nursery that does not strictly limit its capacity can do as much harm as good. When too crowded, it is scarcely better than the children's own homes. The only point in its favor is that adults are in charge of the children instead of their being left unguarded. But to provide such perfunctory attention is not enough for a social agency devoted to child care.

It is difficult, however, to refuse the pleas of the mothers. Each one comes with her pitiful tale. Unless one has a heart of stone, it is hard to turn any of them away.

"You take my Josie and my Jimmie. Then I go to work," a black-swathed mother begs in tragic tones. Her husband has died recently and she is desperate.

Another mother is an equally forlorn case. She is unmarried and has been sent to the Day Nursery by the social agency that has been helping her. Her little girl, trailing behind her, is scrupulously clean. The mother regards her fondly. Quite evidently she hates the thought of putting her in the Day Nursery. But neither does she relish being supported by relief. At least, she can pay the Day Nursery. And small as the sum is, it will make her feel independent at once. When both the social agency and the mother are pressing the Day Nursery, a refusal is doubly difficult.

Nor are other cases easy to reject. For instance, Mrs. Bartolomeo has a sick husband. He must stay in bed most of the time. If necessary he can look after himself. This does not, however, solve the problem of the children. So she appeals to the Day Nursery. Never before has she had to ask for anything. Consequently it is very sad indeed if her application cannot be accepted.

"What shall I do?" she wails pathetically. "I do so hate to take relief."

It is the same with Mrs. Siegel. In desperation she comes to the Day Nursery. If only her baby can be taken, she is sure that she and her husband can straighten out their affairs. There is still hope in the face of this slip of a girl. Her husband, but little older, pleads too. In his arms is the baby, just big enough to be frightened by the strange surroundings. Their story is simple. Two years ago both Mr. and Mrs. Siegel had jobs. Since they were very much in love they married. Both continue to work. Then before they were ready, a baby came. To meet the extra expense, and

because the wife could no longer work, they had to borrow heavily. His earnings were not enough to support the three of them. Now they have decided to put the baby in a Day Nursery so that Mrs. Siegel can return to work. Their only thought is to pay back what they owe and start over again.

Mrs. Brown is in an equally trying situation. Her husband is in the army. When he was drafted she had an excellent position. But then unexpectedly the baby came. For a while she had enough reserve funds. But now these are low. Already she has returned to her own familly. However, this arrangement is not satisfactory. She has one small room for herself and her child. If she could go to work again, she could have her own home. This is impossible on the allowance that she receives from her husband. Therefore she turns to the Day Nursery to solve her problem.

So it goes. A procession of mothers—old, young, pretty, and homely—knock at each Day Nursery door. The individual problem may be different, but all need the help the Day Nursery can give. Since their troubles are urgent and for this reason paramount in their minds, it is no wonder that they protest when they are sent away.

"He's so small," one says, pointing to her son sleeping in her arms. "He doesn't take up much room and he's a good boy."

Of course, she does not understand that a Day Nursery cannot be stretched even for a baby. How should she know that the youngest group is the most strictly limited? Of course, it is equally hard to grasp why an older child is refused, particularly when another is accepted.

"You no take my Mario but you take her Millie. What's the matter—my child no good?" complains an irate mother.

The helpless staff member receives the brunt of her wrath. It takes time and energy to explain that the choice has been determined by expediency, not prejudice. The fact that there is a vacancy in the four-year-old group for Millie but none in the two-year-old group for her Mario is beyond her comprehension. So, of course, she protests vigorously.

Perhaps it does not seem important to pacify each mother whose plea cannot be granted. But if it is not done, the reputation of the Day Nursery will suffer in the neighborhood. No Day Nursery with any standing wishes to create antagonism. Therefore it is essential to send every mother away with at least an adequate explanation.

Obviously, too, an attempt should be made to place the child in another Day Nursery. Often this is a time-consuming process. Nor is it always rewarded by success. The fact is that there is a dearth of Day Nurseries in certain communities. This makes the temptation to take every applicant even greater. But this will not really solve the problem; in fact it may make matters worse.

No longer can the Day Nursery dodge the issue. If more children must be accommodated, there is only one solution. It is to build more Day Nurseries. There is a crying need for them today. It is a tragedy that so many Day Nurseries have closed their doors in recent years. This trend has aggravated the situation.

But even when there are too few Day Nurseries, there should not be overcrowding. Important as is the plight of the mother, it should not be remedied at the expense of the children already in the Day Nursery. And they are sure to suffer if the attendance barriers are let down.. No Day Nursery can unduly increase its quota and yet remain efficient.

If every Day Nursery is to do a thorough job, the number of children must be limited. Although there cannot be any fixed rules for all Day Nurseries, one is worth remembering. It is better to be of real help to a few children than to attempt to do a little bit for many. The best standard is to see that each individual child receives attention. Such a principle is at the basis of all child training theories.

Unquestionably, the growing child has certain requirements. Like a cultivated plant, it does not thrive unless the environment is good. Food, fresh air, sleep, and exercise are only the fundamental needs. There are other factors equally important for the child's development, both physical and mental.

The first of these is space in which to play. The healthy child is active. It should have enough room to romp freely. Next, intelligent supervision is essential. Children require both control and encouragement. The person in charge of a Day Nursery wields tremendous influence. Unless he or she is capable of stimulating the growth and expansion of the young mind, it may become warped in the process of unfolding. Character is molded almost imperceptibly. But it takes both brains and heart to accomplish it. Nor can the tools be discounted. For the child, there are toys, play equipment, books, music, and so forth. Without stressing details, it is sufficient to say that these should be carefully selected according to the accepted rules of child training. Last but not least, there should be beauty in the child's physical environment. Subtle as this influence is, it does help to form taste.

Certainly the Day Nursery child needs to have its life enriched in every possible way. It comes from a home where there are frequent emotional crises, aggravated by extreme want. As for the theory that Day Nursery children will become dissatisfied with their own poor homes, it is most probable that this will happen in any case. As a young woman who formerly lived on Manhattan's Lower East Side said of her own experience: "I always thought my home was dreadful. But I didn't know what to do about it until I saw something better." And she added, "I did not crave luxury after seeing it. I knew that it would not bring happiness. All I wanted was a little beauty."

Is this not a natural reaction? Why should anyone be contented with the stark ugliness of a tenement house? Certainly the world will not progress if people are satisfied to live in such hideous squalor.

But perhaps the greatest deprivation for the small child is the lack of play space in these crowded homes. I remember the pathetic tale of a Day Nursery youngster which shows that he longed for a corner of his own.

"Do you know what he does at home?" his mother asked the teacher. "He plays under the bed. And then he leaves his toys there."

To her this was just a naughty trick. She did not realize the significance of the act. Under the bed, the child had privacy. There he could play without interruption. As for the toys, they were less molested there than in the common clothes closet. Like all children he had a strong sense of possession. The fault did not lie here, but in the fact that there was no one in the home to guide it into constructive channels. Obviously, however, the overworked mother could not be blamed for her attitude.

The Day Nursery mother has neither time nor energy

for the fine points of her child's bringing-up. In the morning she must hurry to the Day Nursery before going to work. Then the household chores remain to be done in the evening and during the week end. Between washing, cooking, and keeping the house in order, the working mother has not a minute of leisure. With such a burden of duties she cannot give her child the proper attention. In fact it is remarkable if she is not impatient. Certainly she cannot provide the necessary guidance which includes helping the child to develop through play, and to adapt itself socially.

Consequently, it is up to the Day Nursery to shoulder these responsibilities. The mere fact that it has its children for so many hours, year after year, gives it a unique opportunity. But it is not fair to these children unless it offers them a healthy and happy environment. Unfortunately, there still are Day Nurseries which are remiss in this respect. In some there is a lack from the material standpoint, in others the fault lies in the spirit. An atmosphere which unduly represses children is not right, no matter how well trained are the staff members. And from experience I know that such Day Nurseries exist even today. What a dreadful place to keep children! Day Nurseries can be good, bad, or indifferent.

The tremendous variation in Day Nurseries shows that the movement should be improved as a whole. Otherwise, the attempts to raise the level of the Day Nursery will only be sporadic and temporary. This will mean isolated examples of good Day Nurseries, a situation that exists now. The point is that every Day Nursery should benefit its children.

There is too great divergence in the Day Nurseries. Their programs differ tremendously. In one, education is in the foreground; in another, the medical program is stressed. Or again, a Day Nursery may do intensive case work—that is, each family may be studied very carefully from the social service point of view. There are many sides to a Day Nursery, each of which may be emphasized out of all proportion to the rest. Even the staff is not uniform. Day Nurseries employ whom they please to take care of their children. Teachers may be such in name only or be thoroughly trained for their position.

But perhaps the most astounding fact is that there is no stipulation as to the type of Head. She may be entirely untrained as was the old-fashioned matron, or a highly specialized professional. This latter category includes the trained nurse, the teacher, and the social worker. In spite of the broad scope of the Day Nursery, there is no requirement for an all-around preparation for the Head. Nor need she have executive ability in spite of the responsibility of her position.

It is easy to see that the Day Nursery is hard to evaluate. How can it be said that the Day Nursery fulfills a useful function while there still exist some which are absolutely detrimental to children? How can the movement as a whole progress when each Day Nursery follows its own fancy? Besides, there cannot be any real interchange of ideas under such a system. The strength of any movement lies in its unity. For its own sake the Day Nursery must become a homogeneous whole.

But in order to change the policy of Day Nurseries there must be strict nation-wide supervision. Such action must be stimulated by a neutral body, which has contact with Day Nurseries from one end of the country to the other. Briefly it can do the following things:

In the first place, it can survey the whole field. Every Day Nursery needs impartial criticism. Even the most competent workers may profit from the judgment of an outside person. Anyone on the job is apt to lose perspective. This happens in every line of endeavor. Besides, it is impossible to keep pace with every trend in the movement. Any suggestion may be helpful, particularly if it is based on the vast experience of countless Day Nurseries.

This brings us to the second point worth emphasis. An organization of this kind can be a bureau of information and advice. The data on Day Nurseries is meagre. It should be collected constantly and kept up to date. Then Day Nurseries can compare their results. Also, better advice is forthcoming if such information is on file.

Certainly a Day Nursery just organizing needs such help. Otherwise it has nothing to guide its course. This applies not only to the program but to the location. A Day Nursery may be opened in a district already covered while another neighborhood languishes for one. A central bureau of reference is exceedingly important for such inquiries.

Above all, the idea of the Day Nursery should be crystallized. This will take a great deal of propaganda. At present the general public is only dimly conscious of the well-developed Day Nursery. Even professional people know little about it. And they often scorn the whole Day Nursery movement because they do not recognize its potentialities. The Day Nursery has yet to prove that it can do a tremendous amount of good.

Obviously I have outlined a broad program. To be effective it must be planned for growth. Eventually there should not be a corner of the United States which is not reached. But there is another feature to be stressed. No movement will develop unless it is properly guided. Hence this one should be headed by an expert who knows the Day Nursery from A to Z. Quite evidently she should be a leader—which incidentally is hard to find. Also, she should have the means and staff at her disposal for expansion when the need arises. With the right stimulation the Day Nursery is sure to extend its usefulness.

So far there has been no systematic attack. Consequently, the Day Nursery movement is not going ahead as it should. Only a few people realize its untapped possibilities. Unfortunately the whole movement is tainted by its worst examples.

It is not fair to the mothers and children that the Day Nursery continue on its present course. The working mother cannot get along without its help because no other social agency will save her family from disintegration and allow her to keep her independent feeling. Nor can the world afford to neglect these children. Surely they are entitled to proper care in compensation for the deprivation they suffer at home. Besides, does not every child need wholesome and happy surroundings?

In conclusion, then, there should be more and better Day Nurseries and a strong national body, competent to raise standards. This does not permit of a penurious plan. For it also necessitates education regarding the movement itself. And there must be adequate professional guidance. With the crisis today, the importance of the Day Nursery looms large. Whether it is advisable or not, it is certain that many mothers will be drawn into industry. So is it too much to hope that the result will be a stronger and more intensive Day Nursery program in order that the children of working mothers are properly cared for?

Shakespeare and the Clergy

JOHN HAYNES HOLMES

I was reading *Romeo and Juliet* the other day—renewing my youth in the glowing passion of the Shakespearean verse! In the course of my reading, I fell to pondering Friar Lawrence and his relation to the tragedy. What a hale, healthy, hearty character he is! Could anything be finer than his introduction in Scene III of Act II, when he leaves his cell as "the grey-eyed morn smiles on the frowning night," to gather herbs upon the dewy countryside!

I must fill up this osier cage of ours
With baleful weeds and precious juiced flowers . . .
Many for many virtues excellent,
None but for some, and yet all different.
O, mickle is the powerful grace that lies
In herbs, plants, stones, and their true qualities.
For naught so vile that on the earth doth live,
But to the earth some special good doth give.

This gentle Friar knows Romeo, and loves him. When the boy comes to him in despair for Juliet, he sympathizes at once. He chides the youth for his quick change from Rosaline to Juliet. But when he sees the two lovers together, he understands, and gladly joins them in wedlock. He shrewdly sees also the good possibility of a reconciliation between the warring families of Montague and Capulet in this romantic marriage. Indeed, had these families been as wise before the marriage in Friar Lawrence's spirit as they were after the marriage in the wake of tragedy, there had been no tragedy! The Friar might have managed the affair better, perhaps. In giving the sleeping potion to Juliet, to save her from her unwelcome suitor, Paris, and to restore her to Romeo's arms in Mantua, he gambled desperately—and lost. But his heart was sound and good, his purpose holy. One sees the beauty of the church in this gentle and kindly man. In the Shakespearean drama there are few more attractive episodes than this of the Friar and the two lovers of Verona.

This set me thinking as to other religious characters in Shakespeare's plays. Has anybody ever studied this question? As I write, I am far away from libraries, and thus cannot consult books. Nothing remains but to scan the plays myself.

In doing so, I find few clergymen, either priests or parsons. This probably means that the great dramatist was as little interested in the clergy for their own sake as he was in the profound problems of religion itself. After all, one does not turn to Shakespeare for thoughts upon religious doctrines and ideals! If he places churchmen in his plays, it is for the same reason that he uses peers, and clowns, and soldiers, and citizens—to meet the exigencies of the story, or to serve the technical needs of the drama. Predominant among them, especially in the historical plays, are bishops and archbishops, crowned by the towering figure of the famous cardinal, Wolsey, in *Henry VIII*. But these men are hardly churchmen, least of all ministers of religion, in the true sense of the word. They are primarily political and social figures, playing not spiritual roles at all, but more or less important parts in the secular history of their times. These I put aside as not germane to our little study.

In all the plays, I find only four clergymen worthy of comment, and only one of these four can be regarded as really noteworthy:

1. The first appears in a single scene in *Hamlet*, the churchyard scene (Act V, Scene I) where Ophelia is buried in the presence of the King and Queen, and all their court. The clergyman is here, of course, the officiating priest. There has been trouble about the burial of Ophelia. Thus, it was known that she had lost her mind. It was known that she had been drowned in the brook near "a willow . . . that shows his hoar leaves in the glassy stream." There was more than a suspicion that the poor girl had committed suicide. "Her death was doubtful," says the priest. In this case, under the strict laws of the church, her body could not lie in holy ground, nor be blessed with "the service of the dead." Only the "great command" of Claudius had availed to "the fair Ophelia" that she be allowed

. . . her virgin crants,
Her maiden strewments and the bringing home
Of bell and burial.

The priest was a loyal son of the church—he could not sing a requiem! But as much, perhaps, by his own pitiful desire as by the order of the King, he had enlarged Ophelia's obsequies "as far as we have warranty." There may well be controversy in the interpretation of this scene, as of so many of the scenes in the Shakespearean drama. But I like to feel that Laertes was moved not so much by justice as by passionate, almost insane, grief for his dead sister, as he was when he later grappled with Hamlet in the grave, that he could cry out against the "churlish priest," as he called him. In a perplexing predicament, the priest was not ungenerous.

2. In *Measure For Measure* appear two priests whose action is somewhat clearer than that of the priest in *Hamlet*.

Measure For Measure is an unpleasant play with a highly artificial plot, made endurable by two or three dramatic scenes and at least one specimen of Shakespeare's noblest poetry. It has to do with Vincentio, the ruling Duke of Vienna, who announces that he is leaving his dominions on a trip abroad, and placing all power during his absence in the hands of his deputy, Angelo. Instead of departing, however, he disguises himself in a friar's garb, and stays at home to watch what is going on. The story centers about the *Tosca*-like betrayal of Claudio and his noble sister, Isabella, by the wicked Angelo. The Duke saves the situation by an elaborate masquerade which accomplishes a satisfactory if rather silly denouement.

The first of the two priests in this play appears only in Scene III of Act I—the monastery, in which the Duke finds "secret harbor" for his design of becoming a friar. Father Thomas, the head of the monastery, is obviously dubious about what the Duke is undertaking to do. He voices no strong protest, and refuses no cooperation, but is sensible enough to see that there is unwisdom and perhaps danger in his design.

The second priest, Friar Peter, appears in Acts IV and V, and serves as the Duke's right-hand man in undoing the evil that is afoot. His part in the masquerade is as inane as are the other parts. Also, it has its cruel aspects, as does all the tomfoolery and practical joking of the Elizabethan period. But the important thing here is that Friar Peter, like Friar Thomas, is resolutely on the side of virtue. Neither man is stout and brave: both are obedient subjects of the Duke. But it is this Duke who is the hero of the play, and it

is to churchmen that Shakespeare easily and naturally turns to aid him in his purposes.

3. In that most brilliant of the Shakespearean comedies, *Much Ado About Nothing,* there is a priest who plays a central part in the unfolding of the drama, and a wise, courageous, and independent part.

Much Ado About Nothing, it will be remembered, has a deep undertone of tragedy. The betrayal of Hero, daughter to Leonato and cousin to Beatrice, is as pretty a piece of villainy as can be imagined. In the great cathedral scene which opens Act IV, at the moment of the marriage of Hero and Claudio, the bridegroom suddenly turns upon his bride, and accuses her fiercely of unchastity. He himself has been grossly deceived by Don John, and now visits his charge upon the innocent and lovely lady whom it was already his first duty to protect. But the evidence seems incontrovertible—even Hero's father is convinced! Only Benedick is suspicious, and Beatrice utterly outraged at what she knows to be a wicked falsehood. It is a scene of confusion and dismay—and great drama!

In the midst of the turmoil steps forth the priest, Friar Francis, who was to perform the marriage ceremony. "Hear me a little," he cries,

For I have only been silent so long,
And given way unto this course of fortune,
By noting of the lady: I have marked
A thousand blushing apparitions
To start into her face; a thousand innocent shames
In angel whiteness beat away those blushes;
And in her eye there hath appeared a fire,
To burn the errors that these princes hold
Against her maiden truth. Call me fool:
Trust not my reading nor my observations,
Which with experimental seal doth warrant
The tenour of my book; trust not my age,
My reverence, calling, nor divinity,
If this sweet lady lie not guiltless here
Under some biting error.

The Friar is the only one who has kept his head, also his heart, in this dreadful scene. He has turned to Hero, and watched her reaction upon the most formidable charge that can be brought against a woman. He discovers from observation what Beatrice knows from conviction—that Hero is innocent. And he has the courage, in the face of the excited and frightened company, to say so. Also, he turns to Hero and gives her a chance to speak, and in response to her words of passionate disavowal, declares flatly: "There is some strange misprision in the princes."

But the priest is not content with affirming Hero's innocence. Alone of all the persons present, he has the manhood, and the wit, to take command of the situation, and undertake to correct the wrong that has been done. The stratagems of the plot need not be unfolded in this place, especially as the play is a familiar one. Suffice it to say that Friar Francis takes Hero under his protection, devises the plan for discovering and uncovering the villain, convinces Claudio of the cruel injustice he has done his bride, and restores the maiden to his arms. Incidentally, out of all this comes the delightful union of Beatrice and Benedick. In the tragedy of Hero, they find their love for one another.

The Friar in *Much Ado About Nothing* is strong, wise, deeply human, compassionate, and brave. About his action, and his character turns the whole progress of the drama. So far as any man can play the part of Providence, Friar Francis does it in this crowning example of Shakespeare's comedy. He is a good companion-piece for Friar Lawrence.

I can think of but four other clergymen in the Shakespearean drama. Calchas, the Trojan priest in *Troilus and Cressida,* a pagan and not a Christian figure; Sir Oliver Martext in *As You Like It,* a mere accessory in a single scene; Sir Hugh Evans, described as "a Welsh parson" in *The Merry Wives of Windsor,* but no more to be taken seriously than any other character in that peculiarly vulgar and empty comedy; and Sir Nathaniel, "a curate," who appears as a clownish personage in *Love's Labour's Lost,*" which, as the first and utterly commonplace production of Shakespeare's pen, is not to be included in any judgment upon the author's mind. In several plays, as in *Twelfth Night,* for example, the stage is dressed with priests, along with courtiers, soldiers, sailors, musicians, etc., but this of course is mere scenery.

It will be conceded that the material here is scant. It furnishes an inadequate basis for any elaborate study, though I have not a doubt that a Ph.D. candidate could do wonders with it. But it is evident, it seems to me, that the great Shakespeare had a wholesome respect for churchmen and the church. Within a single year he had put Sir Nathaniel in *Love's Labour's Lost* behind him—assuming, for the sake of argument, that he ever thought seriously of this man as a clergyman at all!—and had moved to the kindly, even loving, depiction of Friar Lawrence in *Romeo and Juliet.* Thereafter clergymen appeared seldom in the plays, except in the case of the great political clerics in the histories. But when they did appear, they were treated with reverence, if seldom with distinction or acclaim. Only Friar Francis, in *Much Ado About Nothing,* rises to heroic stature. It is perhaps a reflection on the predominantly ecclesiastical and even political nature of religion in the Elizabethan age that it intruded so little, and usually in some formal way, upon the vast Shakespearean pageant of human nature.

Changes in Religion

The time has come for widespread recognition of the radical changes in religious beliefs throughout the modern world.

The time is past for mere revision of traditional attitudes. Science and economic change have disrupted old beliefs—made them obsolete.

For centuries the burden of these obsolete religious systems has been otherworldly. Not living, but dying has been the goal—not preparation for a creative life, but preparation for a fanciful heaven.

In every field of human activity, the vital movement is now in the direction of a candid and explicit expression of religion in terms of human goals and human endeavors. Full and creative living here and now is the theme of the modern prophet.

Today religion should consist of those actions, purposes, and experiences that are humanly significant. Nothing that is of real value to people—all people—can be alien. It must include labor, art, science, philosophy, love, friendship, recreation—all that is expressive of good living.

In the fulfillment of this religion of the modern man no knowledge and no wisdom, from whatever field it may come, is taboo. Not a book must receive the imprimatur of an archbishop, not a thought or belief must have the blessing of a priest or preacher. No ritual and no ceremony can be too sacred to change. The modern church must serve free people's needs.

The goal of today's religion must be the progressive enrichment of all of life. PHILIP SCHUG.

The Study Table

Religious Pioneering

THE SOCIAL GOSPEL OF WALTER RAUSCHENBUSCH AND ITS RELATION TO RELIGIOUS EDUCATION. *By Vernon Parker Bodein. New Haven: Yale University Press. 163 pp. $3.00.*

The Yale Studies in Religious Education continues its splendid tradition of keen scholarship with this latest offering on the life, thought, and significance of Walter Rauschenbusch. Here is a study that grows tastier with persistent sampling. It plods along at first, and one tends to become terrified in the earlier chapters that, having used much of the same material as that used in Dr. Dores R. Sharpe's recent volume on the life of Rauschenbusch, this book will degenerate into filiopietistic biography as did its predecessor. Once having cleared away the necessary details of Rauschenbusch's psychological introduction to the implications of the social gospel, however, Dr. Bodein's pen takes wing and traces a convincing word picture of the synthesis of thought and action that lay behind Rauschenbusch's impact on the Christian Church.

The publisher's fly leaf review claims for this book that "it reveals with clarity and cogency the middle way between the two extremes of humanism and 'neo-orthodoxy,' meeting both the need for a changed social order and the need for personal salvation." After reading the book, however, one is led to remark that Dr. Bodein makes no homiletical attempt to "reveal . . . . the middle way," and Mr. Rauschenbusch failed miserably, in terms of his theology, to steer a cogent middle course.

You simply cannot help being impressed, as you follow Dr. Bodein's heavily documented analysis, with the fact that Rauschenbusch attained the apogee of his prowess when he talked and acted like a thoroughgoing Humanist. When he attempted, by means of his intricate concept of the Kingdom of God, to give theological justification to his socio-religious radicalism, you wish he had not bothered. As illustration, there is this summarizing paragraph from *Christianizing the Social Order,* written by Rauschenbusch in 1912:

> Christianizing the social order means bringing it into harmony with the ethical convictions which we *identify* [italics mine] with Christ. A fairly definite body of moral convictions has taken shape in modern humanity. They express our collective conscience, our working religion. The present social order denies and flouts many of these principles of our ethical life and compels us in practice to outrage our better self. We demand therefore that the moral sense of humanity shall be put in control and shall be allowed to reshape the institutions of social life.

If this paragraph were presented unlabelled to Karl Barth for criticism, it seems fairly certain he would shake his head and mutter something about "Humanist folly." Yet one emerges from a reading of this book with the feeling that it was just such convictions as those expressed in the quotation above that supplied Rauschenbusch with his greatest driving power. Dr. Bodein makes very clear, however, that a large portion

Books by Porter Sargent

"THE FUTURE of EDUCATION"

256 pages, red silk cloth, $2.00. The separately published Introduction to the 28th edition of the Handbook of Private Schools, 1024 pp., $6.00.

"As usual you have hit the bull's eye," *J. G. Umstattd, U. of Texas.* "It is certain to stimulate discussion and prompt action," *Payson Smith, U. of Maine.* "Hot stuff, well-seasoned, highly vitaminized," *George Kneller, U. of Kansas City.* "Even more challenging than I anticipated," *Harold Saxe Tuttle, Coll. of N. Y.* "The educator will be challenged, irritated, enlightened, warmed by argument, reinforced in his liberalism, ashamed of his own comparative ignorance," *Philip W. L. Cox, N. Y. Univ.*

"WAR and EDUCATION"

512 pages, black vellum, $4.00

"A wealth of provocative ideas for teachers who are alive to the current weaknesses and failures of education and want to do something about them," *Arthur B. Moehlman, The Nation's Schools.* "One of the few books on education that made any sense to me," *Richard T. LaPiere, Stanford U.* "Extraordinarily good stuff," *W. Lloyd Warner, U. of Chicago.* "Complete and scholarly," *Rockwell Kent.* "A most stimulating book," *Read Bain, Miami U.* "A must book for all men and women," *Marco Morrow, Topeka.* "A vigorous book," *Merle Curti, U. of Wis.* "A mine of information," *Alliston Cragg.* "Amount of information leaves me gasping," *Maj. Gen. J. F. C. Fuller, England.*

Circulars and Table of Contents on Request.

PORTER SARGENT

11 BEACON STREET, BOSTON 8, MASS.

of Rauschenbusch's toiling hours were spent in expounding a Christocentric doctrine of the Kingdom of God that makes the observer wish this great religious prophet could have read and digested such books as Cadbury's *The Peril of Modernizing Jesus,* or Schweitzer's *Quest for the Historical Jesus.*

Dr. Bodein's own lukewarm recommendation of Rauschenbusch's theological product appears to justify the foregoing criticism when he says: "Rauschenbusch did a worth-while and a pioneer work in presenting a theology for the social gospel. His genius, however, lay in the prophetic realm. He was more of a prophet than a theologian."

The concluding chapter of the book expertly scrutinizes the relationship of Rauschenbusch's prophetism to religious education, and it reveals in an original manner how deeply concerned this pioneer of the social gospel was with the processes of religious instruction. Though Rauschenbusch never systematized his concepts of religious education, his writings convey cogent implications for the total educational policy of the Church. The influence of Josiah Royce's notion that society exerts superpersonal forces of good and evil apart from the mental existence of individuals is immediately apparent. Believing zealously that social salvation would come about through a two-pronged offensive of education and intelligent, devoted social action, Rauschenbusch formulated four major premises for an educational method: sensitivity to the existence of social evil, moral and religious rather than technical tests of salvation, salvation through education and action, and the Church as an indispensable factor in social salvation by virtue of its exposal of selfishness and its projection of love.

One comes away from a reading of Dr. Bodein's book with a renewed sense of appreciation for the stature of Walter Rauschenbusch as a true pathfinder in the wilderness of social and personal religion. In these days when the flood tides of a "return to orthodoxy" are sweeping the shores of sophisticated Protestantism, this full-length study of Rauschenbusch's clarion call to social prophetism is both timely and pertinent literature.

JACK MENDELSOHN, JR.

Russia, Past and Present

A SHORT HISTORY OF RUSSIA. *By B. H. Sumner. New York: Reynal and Hitchcock. 469 pp. $3.75.*

This important book should be in the library and in the hands of everyone interested in the new world that is supposed to come after the second World War. Russia, without any doubt, will be able to dominate Europe. The sympathy of the nations is with her because of the sufferings she has endured. But what has shaped the present Russia? This book is the story of Russia beginning at the present. A word needs to be said about the author's view of history. He begins at the Soviet regime and goes backward. The usual method is to begin at the dim past and lead up to the present. But much can be said for Professor Sumner's method, beginning as it does with 1941 and going back, step by step, to 860. The real advantage to most Americans lies in the fact that they know a good deal about the present Soviet regime, but nothing about earlier Russian history. How many schools in the United States ever taught Russian history or paid any attention to it until the present? Until the present time, Russia has been the least known of all the great nations of the earth, but that has all changed. This book is probably the best book in print to introduce the average reader to our great Ally.

C. A. HAWLEY.

Books Received

AMERICAN JEWISH YEARBOOK. Vol. 46. *Edited for The American Jewish Committee by Harry Schneiderman. Philadelphia: The Jewish Publication Society of America. 620 pp. $3.00.*

GERMANY'S STEPCHILDREN. *By Solomon Liptzin. Philadelphia: The Jewish Publication Society of America. 298 pp. $3.00.*

IN QUEST OF JUSTICE. *By Francis Neilson. New York: Robert Schalkenbach Foundation. 135 pp. $1.00.*

SABBATH—THE DAY OF DELIGHT. *By Abraham E. Millgram. Philadelphia: The Jewish Publication Society of America. 495 pp. $3.00.*

THE WAY TO FREEDOM. *By Meyer Edelbaum. New York: Bloch Publishing Co. 284 pp. $2.50.*

The Field

(*Continued from page* 178)

sheriff's substitute. Appeals can also be made to Appellate Tribunals.

Men who refuse to register at all under the Acts can be registered as conscientious objectors by the Ministry of Labour, if the Ministry is certain that the men have some form of conscientious objection.

Of roughly 930,000 women deemed liable under the National Service Acts for military service, 2,555 have registered as C.O.s. Of these, 8 per cent were granted unconditional exemption, while 74 per cent were conditionally registered; 3 per cent were also allowed to do specifically non-combatant duties in H.M. Forces. Fifteen per cent of the applicants in this category were removed from the register. Court proceedings against C.O.s have been far fewer in this war than in the last; 2,300 men have been sentenced to terms of imprisonment of three months or more for refusing medical examination after their cases have been rejected by Tribunals; 258 men and 65 women have also been prosecuted for failing to comply with their conditions of exemption.

The Tribunals have not confined their interpretation of the term "conscientious objection" to objections based on religion alone. The curious fact is that the best known pacifist religious body, the Society of Friends, has contributed a comparatively low proportion of the conscientious objectors, the bulk coming from larger nonconformist bodies like the Methodists.

Whatever one's own personal views of individual conscientious objectors may be, the Ministry of Labour deserves congratulations on the fair-minded attempt it has made so far to tackle the problem of this minority, for upon its shoulders has fallen the difficult task of interpreting the spirit as well as the letter of the law.

The Ministry has also probably saved the country endless bother and expense, for had there been a determined attempt to force the objector into the Forces, undoubtedly the military authorities would have had countless problems of discipline and much hostile criticism, as in the last war.

Such persecution as the C.O. has suffered has been mainly economic, since there is an understandable reluctance to employ people whose opinions conflict so sharply with those of the majority. Big employers, like the local authorities, for example, have practically boycotted the conscientious objector.

On the whole, however, the British people and Government must receive the credit for attempting to fit into wartime society those who interpret the will of God in a manner flatly opposite to that given by their political and religious leaders.—*The Inquirer,* London.

Western Unitarian Conference

RANDALL S. HILTON, Executive Secretary
700 Oakwood Boulevard, Chicago 15, Illinois

APPROBATION

"I think Curtis Reese's Dumbarton Oaks editorial in the January UNITY is one of the very finest statements on the subject I have seen anywhere; it is magnificent."—Stephen H. Fritchman, Editor, *The Christian Register*.

NATIONAL LEADERS AT GENEVA

Several of our national leaders have already agreed to come to our Geneva Conference to be held at College Camp, Wisconsin, August 19-26, 1945. Genevans of former years will be happy to know that Mrs. Sophia Fahs is to be with us again. Also Miss Frances Wood, who recently visited several of our Western Conference churches, is coming to give two courses. The third one is Rev. Stephen H. Fritchman, Editor of *The Christian Register* and Advisor to the American Unitarian Youth. Mr. Fritchman, who has in the past been at Geneva for the Youth Conferences, will this year give a course for adults. The Laymen's League and the Alliance are sending Mr. and Mrs. Fred McGill. There will be others, and announcement of these will be made later.

THE O.D.T. AND GENEVA

It is not yet clear just what the Office of Defense Transportation will decide concerning religious training conferences and institutes. As soon as definite information is available it will be sent out. In the meantime we are going ahead with our plans.

IOWA MINISTERS TO MEET

The ministers in the Iowa Unitarian Association will meet at Iowa City on February 26 and 27. Dr. Charles E. Snyder, Davenport, Secretary of the Association, sent out the call for the meeting. Rev. Evans Worthley, the host minister, is the vice-president.

HYND TO ADDRESS HUMANISTS

Dr. J. Hutton Hynd, Leader of the St. Louis Ethical Society, will give the principal address at the annual meeting of the American Humanist Association, February 26. Dr. Curtis Reese will be the discussion leader. The meeting will be held at the Third Unitarian Church of Chicago, at 6 P.M.

MISS BAER TO CALIFORNIA

Miss Florence Baer, Associate Director of the Department of Unitarian Extension and Church Maintenance, Boston, passed through Chicago on her way to California. She will spend six months visiting the churches on the West Coast. While in Chicago she spoke to the students at Meadville and visited several of the churches in the Chicago area.

TRAPP LEAVES DENVER

Dr. Jacob Trapp, minister of the Unitarian Church in Denver, has been called to the pulpit of the church in Summit, New Jersey. Dr. Trapp went to Denver in 1941 from Salt Lake City. In Summit he will succeed Rev. A. Powell Davies who recently became the minister of our church in Washington, D. C. Rev. Rudolph Gilbert, formerly minister at Bloomington, Illinois, and Cedar Rapids, Iowa, has gone to Denver as the stated supply.

MEADVILLE BOARD

Three Western Conference men were elected to the Board of Trustees of the Meadville Theological School at the meeting of the Board, January 17, at Meadville, Pennsylvania. They were Rev. Raymond B. Bragg, minister of the Unitarian Church of Minneapolis and former Secretary of the Western Conference, Mr. Howard Clapham, a member of the Third Unitarian Church of Chicago, and Rev. Tracy Pullman, minister of the Unitarian-Universalist Church of Detroit, Michigan.

BEVERLY CHAPEL

"The Castle" parlor, which has served as the place of worship for the Beverly Unitarian Fellowship, is undergoing renovating and remodelling. It is being transformed into a beautiful chapel. It will be dedicated on March 4. The Beverly church, one of the newest churches in the Conference, is one of the fastest growing churches in the Unitarian Fellowship. Mr. Jack Mendelsohn is the minister.

FLINT FREE OF DEBT

Dr. Harold Scott has announced that the continuing efforts of the members of the congregation of the Flint church during the past eighteen months resulted in their paying off the mortgage on the property. Dr. Scott and the congregation are to be congratulated.

GRANT BUTLER INSTALLED

Sunday night, January 28, Rev. Grant Butler was installed as minister of the Unitarian Church of Des Moines, Iowa. The installation sermon was delivered by Rev. John Nicholls Booth, minister of the Unitarian Church of Evanston, Illinois. Rev. Randall S. Hilton gave the charges to the minister and the congregation. Mr. John McVicar, Mayor of Des Moines, welcomed Mr. Butler to the community and spoke of Des Moines' post-war plans. Mr. E. A. Franquemont, Chairman of the Board, presided.

ON MR. HILTON'S ITINERARY

Dec. 31—People's Liberal Church, Chicago.

Jan. 8-11—Boston.
Department of Unitarian Extension and Church Maintenance, Unitarian Ministerial Union Executive Committee, American Unitarian Association Board and Administrative Staff Meetings.

Jan. 14—Madison, Wisconsin.

Jan. 21—Radio Broadcast, Chicago Unitarian Council.

Jan. 28—Des Moines, Iowa.

PEOPLE'S LIBERAL CHURCH

The People's Liberal Church of Chicago has called Rev. Robert S. Hoagland, now minister at Fort Wayne, Indiana. Mr. Hoagland will take up his duties in Chicago in the near future.

THE UNITED APPEAL

Each of the past two years has seen an increase in the contribution of the churches of the Western Conference to the United Appeal and the Unitarian Service Committee. If every church makes a sincere effort to reach its "share" we can do it again this year. The cause for which we work is worthy of our best efforts and our generous support.

REMEMBER THE LAKE GENEVA CONFERENCE—AUGUST 19-26, 1945